

REMARKS

In the above-identified Office Action Claims 13, 15, and 16 were again rejected as being anticipated by the disclosure of the previously cited Amir reference, while Claim 17 was also rejected again as being obvious in view of the disclosures of Amir and the previously cited Wolf reference. In response, independent Claim 13 has been amended in a manner which is believed to stress patentable distinctions over the cited art, and is believed to be allowable for the reasons set forth below.

As clearly required in amended Claim 13, an image processing apparatus is arranged to reproduce a moving image, which is one continuous video, from a storage medium in such a manner that:

if a predetermined reproduction time is passed without a first button being pressed, reproduction of the moving image is stopped, while if the first button is pressed before the predetermined reproduction time is passed, reproduction of the moving image is continued even if the predetermined reproduction time is passed, to reproduce the moving image up to the end of the one continuous video and to start reproduction of a next moving image which is of another continuous video and is not included in the moving image reproduced up to the end thereof; and

if a second button is pressed during the continued reproduction of the moving image after the first button is pressed before the predetermined reproduction time is passed, the continued reproduction of the moving image is terminated and then reproduction is started in accordance with the predetermined reproduction time to produce the next moving

image which is of another continuous video and is not included in the moving image reproduction which is terminated in response to the second button (Fig.3 and accompanied description).

That is, in the present invention, the moving image of one continuous video is reproduced in different manners in accordance with a relationship between an elapse of time and the depression of each of the first and second buttons. According to these features of the present invention, a more useful slide show system is made available.

Referring now to the cited prior art, the Amir reference discloses in Figs.1-2 to switch over reproduction between a skim video and full length video in response to the click of a tab 18 (Figs.1 and 2). In addition, Amir discloses reproduction of a play-list as an implementation of such switching between the videos ([0034]). On the other hand, the Wolf reference is relied on in the Office Action merely as disclosing a digital camera included in an image processing apparatus. In any event, the above-characterized invention by Applicant as set forth in Claim 13, is not disclosed by these references.

That is, reproduction switching in Amir, between the segments of the play-list as well as between the skim video and the full length video, is not related to the present invention as presented in Applicant's Claim 13. Specifically, Amir fails to disclose reproducing a moving image which is one continuous video in different manners including switching between the reproduced moving image and a next moving image which is of another continuous video and is not included in the reproduced moving image. In this connection, it should be noted that the Amir play-list is not one continuous video as asserted in the Office Action. Further, Amir is silent as to reproduction control performed during reproduction of one segment of the play-list in

a manner recited in amended Claim 13. Therefore, reproduction of the play-list, which may include sequential reproduction of the segments, does not disclose or suggest reproducing one continuous video in such a manner recited in the amended Claim 13.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the requirements of amended Claim 13 are clearly patentably distinct over the disclosure of the Amir reference. Also, it is noted that the Wolf patent does not overcome the above-described deficiencies of Amir as a rejecting reference.

For these reasons it is respectfully submitted that Claim 13, as well as the claims dependent thereon, are allowable over the prior art, wherefore Applicant solicits the issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3939.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

John A. Krause/
John A. Krause
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 24,613

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200